arXiv:0812.0678v1 [quant-ph] 3 Dec 2008

Does path integral really need a Lagrangian/Hamiltonian?

Denis Kochan*
Department of Theoretical Physics,
FMFI, Comenius University,
842 48 Bratislava, Slovakia
(Dated: December 3, 2008)

Path integral formulation of quantum mechanics is strongly dependent on a given Lagrangian and/or Hamiltonian function. In the paper a simple rearrangement of the path integral to a surface functional integral is proposed. It is shown that the surface integral formulation of a transition probability amplitude is free of any particular choices and requires just the underlying classical equations of motion. A simple example examining functionality of the proposed method is considered.

Dedicated to my friend, colleague and (former) teacher Pavel Bóna.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ca, 11.10.Ef, 31.15.xk

I. FEYNMAN QUANTUM MECHANICS

According to Feynman the probability amplitude of the transition of a system from the space-time configuration (q_0, t_0) to (q_1, t_1) is given as follows:

$$\mathbf{A}(q_1, t_1 \,|\, q_0, t_0) \propto \int [\mathcal{D}\tilde{\gamma}] \exp\left\{\frac{i}{\hbar}\int\limits_{\tilde{\gamma}} p_a dq^a - H dt\right\}. \quad (1)$$

Here the path-summation is taken over all trajectories $\tilde{\gamma}(t) = (\tilde{q}(t), \tilde{p}(t), t)$ in the extended phase space which are constrained as follows: $\tilde{q}(t_0) = q_0$ and $\tilde{q}(t_1) = q_1$.

To obtain a proper normalization of the Feynman propagator, one requires the following two physical conditions. The first one asks for the conservation of the total probability, i.e.

$$\int\limits_{\mathbf{R}^n[q_1]} dq_1 \, \overline{\mathbf{A}(q_1, t_1 \,|\, \tilde{q}_0, t_0)}\, \mathbf{A}(q_1, t_1 \,|\, q_0, t_0) = \delta(\tilde{q}_0 - q_0)\,.$$

The second condition expresses an obvious fact that no evolution happens if t_1 approaches the initial time t_0, hence

$$\lim_{t_1 \to t_0} \mathbf{A}(q_1, t_1 \,|\, q_0, t_0) = \delta(q_1 - q_0)\,.$$

It is a miraculous consequence (not requirement!) of the propagator definition that it satisfies an evolutionary chain rule (Chapman-Kolmogorov equation)

$$\mathbf{A}(q_1, t_1 \,|\, q_0, t_0) = \int\limits_{\mathbf{R}^n[q]} dq \; \mathbf{A}(q_1, t_1 \,|\, q, t)\, \mathbf{A}(q, t \,|\, q_0, t_0)\,,$$

whose infinitesimal version is equivalent to the celebrated Schrödinger equation.

It is a curious thing that Formula (1) was not originally discovered by Feynman. In his pioneering work [1] he arrives to a functional integral in the configuration space only

$$\mathbf{A}(q_1, t_1 \,|\, q_0, t_0) \propto \int [\mathcal{D}q] \exp\left\{\frac{i}{\hbar}\int\limits_{q(t)} L(q, \dot{q}, t) dt\right\}. \quad (2)$$

Later, however, it was shown that this is equivalent to the most general prescription (1) in the case of Hamiltonias that are quadratic in momenta. Formula (1) represents the cornerstone for our further discussion.

II. ONE STEP BEYOND FEYNMAN

A step beyond consists of the elimination of the Hamiltonian function H from Formula (1). The price to be paid for this will be replacement of the path summation therein by a surface functional integration.

Our aim is to compute the transition probability amplitude between (q_0, t_0) and (q_1, t_1). Let us suppose that there exists a classical trajectory in the extended phase space $\gamma_{cl}(t) = (q_{cl}(t), p_{cl}(t), t)$ which connects these points. Then for any other curve $\tilde{\gamma}(t) = (\tilde{q}(t), \tilde{p}(t), t)$ which enters the path summation in (1), we can arbitrarily assign two auxiliary curves $\lambda_0(s)$ and $\lambda_1(s)$, which live in the momentum sector only. They are parameterized by $s \in [0, 1]$ and specified as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_0(s) &= (q_0, \pi(s), t_0) \text{ where: } \pi(0) = p_{cl}(t_0),\ \pi(1) = \tilde{p}(t_0), \\ \lambda_1(s) &= (q_1, \phi(s), t_1) \text{ where: } \phi(0) = p_{cl}(t_1),\ \phi(1) = \tilde{p}(t_1). \end{aligned}$$

Using these auxiliary curves in the extended phase space one can write:

$$\int\limits_{\tilde{\gamma}} p_a dq^a - H dt = \int\limits_{\gamma_{cl}} p_a dq^a - H dt + \oint\limits_{\partial\Sigma} p_a dq^a - H dt\,, \quad (3)$$

---

*Electronic address: kochan@fmph.uniba.sk

where $\partial\Sigma = \tilde{\gamma} - \lambda_1 - \gamma_{cl} + \lambda_0$ is a contour, which contains four curves $\tilde{\gamma}(t)$, $\gamma_{cl}(t)$, $\lambda_0(s)$, $\lambda_1(s)$. The first integral on the right is the classical action $\mathbf{S}_{cl}(q_1, t_1 \,|\, q_0, t_0)$. While the contour integral in (3) can be rearranged to represent a surface integral:

$$\oint\limits_{\partial\Sigma} p_a dq^a - H dt = \int\limits_{\Sigma} dp_a\big(dq^a - \frac{\partial q^a}{\partial t}dt\big) + F_a dq^a dt =: \int\limits_{\Sigma} \Omega\,.$$

On the right there are components of force field F, whose potential energy enters the initial Hamiltonian function H. Surface Σ which spans the contour $\partial\Sigma$ is understood here as a map from the parametric space $(t,s) \in [t_0, t_1] \times [0,1]$ to the extended phase space, i.e.

$$\Sigma : (t,s) \mapsto \big(q^a(t,s), p_a(t,s), t(t,s) = t\big)\,.$$

It is clear that for a given pair of trajectories $(\tilde{\gamma}, \gamma_{cl})$ there exist infinitely many such surfaces. They form a set which we call $\mathcal{U}_{\tilde{\gamma}}$. Since $\int_\Sigma \Omega$ is only boundary dependent and Formula (3) is satisfied, we immediately arrive to the following expression:

$$\exp\Big\{\frac{i}{\hbar}\int\limits_{\tilde{\gamma}} pdq - Hdt\Big\} = \frac{\mathrm{e}^{\frac{i}{\hbar}\mathbf{S}_{cl}}}{\mathrm{N}_{\tilde{\gamma}}} \int\limits_{\mathcal{U}_{\tilde{\gamma}}} [\mathcal{D}\Sigma] \exp\Big\{\frac{i}{\hbar}\int\limits_{\Sigma} \Omega\Big\}.$$

Here we denoted by $\mathrm{N}_{\tilde{\gamma}}$ a cardinality of the underlying stringy set $\mathcal{U}_{\tilde{\gamma}}$. Assuming no topological obstructions from the side of the extended phase space, $\mathrm{N}_{\tilde{\gamma}}$ becomes an infinite constant independent of $\tilde{\gamma}$. Taking all of this into account we can rewrite (1) as follows:

$$\mathbf{A}(q_1, t_1 \,|\, q_0, t_0) \propto \mathrm{e}^{\frac{i}{\hbar}\mathbf{S}_{cl}} \int\limits_{\mathcal{U}} [\mathcal{D}\Sigma] \exp\Big\{\frac{i}{\hbar}\int\limits_{\Sigma} \Omega\Big\}\,. \qquad (4)$$

In the formula above an undetermined multiple normalization constant N was dropped out and the path integral over $\tilde{\gamma}$'s was converted to the surface functional integral, as was promised above:

$$\int [\mathcal{D}\tilde{\gamma}] \int\limits_{\mathcal{U}_{\tilde{\gamma}}} [\mathcal{D}\Sigma] \cdots \;=\; \int\limits_{\bigcup_{\tilde{\gamma}} \mathcal{U}_{\tilde{\gamma}}} [\mathcal{D}\Sigma] \cdots \;=: \int\limits_{\mathcal{U}} [\mathcal{D}\Sigma] \cdots \;.$$

The set $\mathcal{U} = \bigcup_{\tilde{\gamma}} \mathcal{U}_{\tilde{\gamma}}$ over which the functional integration is performed contains all extended phase space strings which are anchored to the given classical trajectory γ_{cl}.

To eliminate Hamiltonian H completely we need to express $\mathbf{S}_{cl}(q_1, t_1 \,|\, q_0, t_0)$ in terms of the force field. Such a quantity can be introduced for the given classical solution $\gamma_{cl}(t) = (q_{cl}(t), p_{cl}(t), t)$ as follows:

$$\mathbf{S}_{cl} := \int\limits_{t_0}^{t_1} dt \Big\{\frac{p_{cl}^2(t)}{2m} + \int\limits_{t_0}^{t} ds\, \dot{q}_{cl}^a(s) F_a\big(q_{cl}(s), p_{cl}(s), s\big)\Big\}\,. \quad (5)$$

In the presence of the potential generated forces this converts into the classical action, as desired. Together with the propagator formula (4) this completes our *One step Beyond Feynman's.*

III. ONE MORE STEP BEYOND

The major advantage of the formulation of the Feynman propagator in terms of the surface functional integral rests in its explicit dependence on the force field. The F components of are easily read off from the corresponding classical equations of motion:

$$m\dot{q}^a = p_a \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{p}_a = F_a\,.$$

From the point of view of classical physics the dynamical equations seem to be more fundamental than their ambiguous Hamiltonian and/or Lagrangian precursors [2]. Just derived formulas (4) and (5) therefore represent a new way for a direct quantization of classical systems which uses only the underlying dynamical equations of motion. There are, of course, some hidden subtleties which we pass over in silence, but all of them can be found in [3].

It is clear that for the potential generated force F the surface functional integral (4) gives nothing new compared to (1). To show its functionality we need to analyze either a non-Lagrangian system [4] or a dissipative one. For the sake of simplicity let us focus on the second case. To this end, let us consider a system consisting of a free particle with unit mass affected by friction:

$$\ddot{q} = -\kappa\dot{q} \quad\Leftrightarrow\quad \Omega = dp(dq - pdt) - \kappa p\, dqdt\,.$$

In this case, the surface functional integral can be worked out explicitly (for details see [3]). In the result we arrive to the path integral in the configuration space with a surprisingly trivial result:

$$\int\limits_{\mathcal{U}} [\mathcal{D}\Sigma]\, \exp\Big\{\frac{i}{\hbar}\int\limits_{\Sigma}\Omega\Big\} \propto \exp\Big\{-\frac{i}{\hbar}\int\limits_{t_0}^{t_1}\big(\tfrac{1}{2}\dot{q}_{cl}^2 - \kappa p_{cl} q_{cl}\big)dt\Big\} \times$$

$$\times \int [\mathcal{D}q] \exp\Big\{\frac{i}{\hbar}\int\limits_{t_0}^{t_1}\big(\tfrac{1}{2}\dot{q}^2 - \kappa p_{cl} q\big)dt\Big\} \propto 1\,.$$

Thus everything what is really needed is represented by the classical action. This quantity can be easily computed having classical solutions q_{cl} and p_{cl} within the prescribed initial and final endpoints. The comprehensive result is as follows:

$$\mathbf{S}_{cl}^{\mathrm{damp}} = \frac{\kappa}{2}\,\frac{1 - \kappa(t_1 - t_0) - \mathrm{e}^{-2\kappa(t_1 - t_0)}}{(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\kappa(t_1 - t_0)})^2}\,(q_1 - q_0)^2 = \frac{(q_1 - q_0)^2}{f(t_1 - t_0)}\,.$$

According to (4) the complete probability amplitude is given by the following formula:

$$\mathbf{A}(q_1, t_1 \,|\, q_0, t_0) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{\pi i\hbar\, f(t_1 - t_0)}}\,\exp\Big\{\frac{i}{\hbar}\mathbf{S}_{cl}^{\mathrm{damp}}\Big\}\,. \quad (6)$$

Here we have already employed the normalization conditions specified in the first paragraph. One can immediately verify that in the frictionless limit ($\kappa \to 0$) the transition probability amplitude $\mathbf{A}(q_1, t_1 \,|\, q_0, t_0)$ matches the

Schrödinger propagator of a single free particle. Quantization of dissipative systems has become popular in the last few decades. Many phenomenological techniques and effective methods have been suggested for struggling with this interesting problem. References [5] and [6] provide a very basic list of papers which overcame this point. Let us stress that our method represents an alternative approach compared to [6] and possesses several qualitative advantages. For example, propagator (6) is invariant with respect to time translations, the same symmetry as that presented in the underlying classical dynamics. Moreover, it is reasonable to expect that the "dissipative quantum evolution" will not remain Markovian. This fact is again confirmed, since the probability amplitude under consideration does not satisfy the memoryless Chapman-Kolmogorov equation mentioned earlier.

Finally, let us express a belief that the surface functional method proposed here would be useful and become one of many quantization concepts developed within theoretical physics.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported in part by MŠMT Grant LC06002, ESF project JPD 3 2005/NP1-013 and VEGA Grant 1/3042/06.

A. M. D. G.

[1] R. P. Feynman: *Space-Time Approach to Non-Relativistic Quantum Mechanics*, Rev. of Mod. Phys. **20** (1948), 367-387.

[2] E. P. Wigner: *Do the Equations of Motion Determine the Quantum Mechanical Commutation Relations?*, Phys. Rev. **77** (1950), 711-712.
S. Okubo: *Does the Equation of Motion determine Commutation Relations?*, Phys. Rev. D **22** (1980), 919-923.
M. Henneaux: *Equations of motion, Commutation Relations and Ambiguities in the Lagrangian Formalism*, Annals Phys. **140** (1982), 45-64.

[3] D. Kochan: *Direct quantization of equations of motion*, Acta Polytechnica **47** No. 2-3 (2007), 60-67, arXiv:hep-th/0703073.
D. Kochan: *How to Quantize Forces(?): An Academic Essay How the Strings Could Enter Classical Mechanics*, submitted to JGP, arXiv:hep-th/0612115.
D. Kochan: *Quantization of Non-Lagrangian systems: some irresponsible speculations* AIP Conf. Proc. **956** (2007), 3-8.

[4] J. Douglas: *Solution of the inverse problem in the calculus of variations*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. **50** (1941), 71-128.

[5] H. Beteman: *On Dissipative Systems and Related Variational Principles*, Phys. Rev. **38** (1938), 815-819.
M. D. Kostin: *On the Schrödinger-Langevin Equation*, J. Chem. Phys. **57** (1972), 3589-3591.
K. K. Kan, J. J. Griffin: *Quantized Friction and the Correspondence Principle: Single Particle with Friction*, Phys. Lett. **50B** (1974), 241-243.
R. W. Hasse: *On the Quantum Mechanical Treatment of Dissipative Systems*, J. Math. Phys. **16** (1975), 2005-2011.
U. Weiss: *Quantum Dissipative Systems* (2^{nd} ed.), Series in Modern Condensed Matter Physics-Vol.10, World Scientific, Singapore, 1999.
V. E. Tarasov: *Quantization of non-Hamiltonian and Dissipative Systems*, Phys. Lett. A **288** (2001), 173-182, quant-ph/0311159.
H. P. Breuer, F. Petruccione: *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002.
D. Chruściński, J. Jurkowski: *Quantum damped oscillator I: dissipation and resonances*, Ann. Phys. **321** (2006), 854-874, quant-ph/0506007.

[6] P. Caldirola: *Forze non conservative nella meccanica quantistica*, Nuovo Cim. **18** (1941), 393-400.
E. Kanai: *On the Quantization of the Dissipative Systems*, Prog. Theor. Phys. **3** (1948), 440-442.
I. C. Moreira: *Propagators for the Caldirola-Kanai-Schrödinger Equation*, Lett. Nuovo Cim. **23** (1978), 294-298.
A. D. Jannussis, G. N. Brodimas, A. Strectlas: *Propagator with friction in Quantum Mechanics*, Phys. Lett. **74A** (1979), 6-10.
U. Das, S. Ghosh, P. Sarkar, B. Talukdar: *Quantization of Dissipative Systems with Friction Linear in Velocity*, Physica Scripta. **71** (2005), 235-237.